

February 23, 2014

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I believe from your email comments that you, as I do, have the best interests of the District at heart. I believe what we have to work through are some areas of concern regarding the direction of the District and where the District stands as far as Board input and approval regarding readers and writers workshop. I appreciate your “to the point” email, and plan to address each item. I will start with a brief discussion and review of the history of the development of these programs in the District.

Before I get into that discussion, however, I think it is important that I set the record straight on the matter that you refer to as the “MAIN ISSUE” in your email. I will tell you very respectfully, but also very emphatically, that I did not ignore this issue in any way. The day after receiving your question on, October 29, 2013, a meeting was held at which your question was discussed and I specifically asked for direction as to how to address your question. I was clearly told that the issue would be handled within the Board. As I hope you will agree, after you read the remainder of this response, there is no question that there have been numerous approvals by the Board, reports to the Board and opportunities for the Board to have addressed any questions or concerns. The Board has been kept informed and involved in the development of the District’s approach to literacy on a continual basis for at least the last five years. My request for direction from the Board as to how to respond to your question was not because there is any doubt about the answer but rather because there has been such a long process with numerous points of Board involvement and approval that I wanted some clarification from the Board leadership as to what might be the specific issue that appeared to be generating your question and how I should best proceed to answer your concerns.

Let’s first review the history of the literacy initiatives during my time at the school district. In this email response, I have put together a timeline that outlines the significant activities that have occurred since I first came to Midd-West in July 2009. To accompany the timeline, I will match significant moments when the Board became aware of the activities by way of a report given by me during a public session or by way of direct action taken by the Board in order for the initiatives to continue to move forward.

During the first six months between July 1, 2009, and January 2010, I worked on many things in order to establish priorities for the District based on areas identified as highest need. I met many teachers, held one-on-one meetings with current and former administrators, attended grade-level, department, and faculty meetings, visited numerous classrooms, and held meetings and conducted surveys with the curriculum council leadership team. I reviewed the District’s current Strategic Plan, studied the history of PSSA scores, as well as other data, scanned numerous notes and documents that had been left behind by previous administration, and examined priorities that were outlined in the budget. A portion of that work can be found in my July to August 2009 Entry Plan (Snook, MWSD Entry Plan, 2009).

As a result of those initial meetings and visits I was able to gain an understanding of professional needs and priorities including the District’s needs specific to literacy. I recall two very significant documents from our work that influenced my thinking and understanding of how our students were reacting to the educational programs at Midd-West.

The first document was a checklist of questions assessing various aspects of where we were as a District. It included questions such as:

- “Is it true that as our students progress from grade to grade their dislike of reading intensifies?” (62%-Yes, 0%-No, 38%-Not Sure)
- “Is our quest for higher test scores harming our students’ long-term reading prospects?” (92%-Yes, 0%-No, 8%-Not Sure)
- “Is our treatment of struggling readers helping to lift them out of the remedial reading track?” (8%-Yes, 77%-No, 15%-Not Sure)
- “Are the same students mired in remedial classes year after year?” (85%-Yes, 0%-No, 15%-Not Sure). (See Hard Talk Checklist, September 2009).

The second document was a summary of additional aspects of our reading programming here at Midd-West that were identified by teachers as significant. Some of the comments teachers wrote included:

- “If things do not change, kids will fail.”
- “Students inability to read, or read well, is an issue that needs to be focused on by the entire school.”
- “Students are not reading enough in school, they do not enjoy reading, and scores are reflecting that behavior.” (MWSD Curriculum Council minutes September - December 2009).

My review of the District’s Strategic Plan dated 2008-2014, as well as my review of PSSA scores told me several things. First, reading achievement was identified in the Strategic Plan as a goal and a priority. The plan at that time to address this priority included four strategies:

1. The implementation of full day kindergarten
2. A direct focus on data
3. Attention to curriculum and instruction
4. An investment in professional development

Teachers completed professional development surveys in April 2008. Results of those surveys directed at the goal of increasing reading achievement include:

- Training and strategies to increase the achievement of special education students (63%)
- Strategies for increasing the achievement of low-motivated students (79%)
- Training for differentiated instruction for students who were below grade level (67%) and above grade level (76%)
- Improving positive parent involvement (67%)
- Training in effective strategies for increasing student time on task
- Building students’ self-esteem (72%)

A professional development needs assessment was completed by the professional education planning committee in early 2009. The committee’s reflections included an analysis of student achievement data at that time, which highlighted:

- An increase in reading scores in 3rd and 4th grades
- A decrease in reading scores in 5th and 6th grades
- An increase in reading scores in 7th and 8th grades, and
- A decrease in reading scores in 11th grade.

It was noted that:

- 11th grade reading scores “showed a significant decline on the PSSA.”
- Fluency and comprehension was a “challenge” in 1st and 2nd grades as determined by:
 - 1) The low number of opportunities that students have to practice fluency;
 - 2) The knowledge base of the teachers in strategies for improving fluency;
 - 3) The knowledge base of the teachers in strategies for improving comprehension.

Source: (MWSD Professional Education Report last approved Thursday, January 29, 2009, p. 2-3).

These things; the meetings, the review of data, the District’s Strategic Plan, the surveys, and the needs assessment, caused us to identify literacy as our main priority.

The Board first became involved in the initiative to improve reading achievement through its involvement in the work of the Strategic Plan planning committee and the approval of the 2008-2014 Midd-West Strategic Plan. The Board approved the Plan on June 30, 2008. Additionally, all curriculum council meeting minutes have been posted on the Midd-West School District wiki since September 2009, and my Board reports began emphasizing this focus as early as August 2009 (Board Reports, August 3, November 16, December 7, 2009).

As we began developing strategies for how the goal of improving reading achievement would be met, we worked on several elements simultaneously. Significant activities included:

- Sending our first cohort of teachers to a four-day Reading Apprenticeship training where they learned many different strategies for engaging students in strategies for comprehending a variety of content area text.
- Formulating data teams across the district to look deeply at the reading and writing areas causing students the most difficulties.
- Working on school improvement plans, and using the data from the data teams to embed supports across our specific weak areas.
- Learning about the Pennsylvania Department of Education’s new Standards-Aligned System (SAS) for accessing reading and writing standards, curriculum, assessments, materials and resources, and strategies for instruction.
- Writing curriculum for a new high school Contemporary Literature course to work on improving reading skills and strategies at the high school, and
- Forming a Literacy Team.

Each of these elements was presented to the Board during my report on January 26, 2010, and each component was addressed in the minutes of the monthly curriculum council meetings.

Several of the elements above were approved by the Board as independent motions. Some of the elements were approved as part of the District’s Strategic Plan, Professional Education Plan, or Final Budget. For example, Reading Apprenticeship was not approved as a specific Board approved professional development activity, however, it is a professional development workshop that supports teachers in differentiated instruction, comprehension strategies, pre-, during-, and after-reading strategies, engaging students in text, and developing vocabulary; all of which are areas of need as identified and incorporated into the Board approved Strategic Plan. Data teams and the funding required for substitutes to cover classes while groups of

teachers worked on school improvement plans was not approved as an independent activity, but was also included under the Board approved District's Strategic Plans and Budget.

Specific elements that were approved independently were the Contemporary Literature course, which was approved by the Board on April 12, 2010, and the use of SAS "as a resource for curriculum, instruction, assessment, remediation, and resources." which was approved by the Board on March 14, 2011. I mention SAS because the entire writing workshop curriculum the teachers have written is housed on this portal.

The Literacy Team was formed to begin working on the specific needs of the elementary program. Although we had several participants from across K-8 grade levels, including a few teachers who teach outside of the English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum, our focus was intended to be on the K-5 program.

Over the course of five months from our first Literacy Team meeting on January 13, 2010, until our final meeting of the 2009-2010 school year on May 20, 2010, we focused on the area identified as our greatest need, writing. Writing was the focus because, quite frankly, at that time the only consistent teaching of writing that was occurring at the elementary level was *Kid Writing* in the kindergarten classroom. Nevertheless, we identified the important components or non-negotiables we wanted to be part of our elementary writing program (Literacy Team Minutes, January 13, 2010). We read articles, reviewed materials, studied standards, talked about the importance of professional development, allocated time in the schedule just for writing, and had many discussions about our direction. The committee processed such things as:

- "What is your vision of a consistent district writing program?"
- "What writing skills should be mastered at each grade level?"
- "What are your thoughts on Kid Writing as compared to Writer's Workshop?" (Literacy Team Minutes, February 12, 2010).

We completed more planning on March 25, 2010, to include a discussion about professional development and implementation. Additionally, grade-level groups reviewed the Units of Study materials during an investigation of writer's workshop (Literacy Team Minutes, March 25, 2010).

Input was solicited by asking all committee members to provide thoughts for moving forward with writer's workshop (Literacy Team Minutes, April 29, 2010), followed by additional discussion time that took place at the May 20, 2010, meeting to solidify our direction for the 2010-2011 school year (Literacy Team Minutes, May 20, 2010).

As a result of this series of Literacy Team meetings, a plan was put together that included the following:

- Kindergarten will continue to use *Kid Writing*
- Writing workshop will be implemented in 1st through 4th grades using the Heinemann Units of Study for Teaching Writing Primary and Intermediate
- A scope and sequence will be generated using the PA Standards and the Standards-Aligned System tool
- Prompts will continue to be utilized in addition to the Units of Study
- Principals will communicate the direction to all teachers on June 2, 2010
- Teachers will have their materials before leaving for the summer

- A visit will be scheduled on June 16, 2010 to see the work in action (Board Report June 28, 2010)
- Professional development will begin in August (Literacy Team Minutes, May 20, 2010)

For additional reports on the literacy focus, see Board Minutes from March 22, 2010, May 24, 2010, and June 14, 2010.

That summer one of the reading specialists, Rene Hoagland, and I attended the August Writing Institute at Columbia University Teachers College. We knew at that time it was too late to schedule support through staff developers from Teachers College, so we went there for training to bring support back to our teachers here at Midd-West. We got so excited about what we learned that we came back ready to bring 5th grade into the first year implementation group as well, which we did.

Outside of the summer writing institute Rene and I attended, our first year of professional development for all 1st through 5th grade teachers consisted of a one-day overview of the foundations of writing workshop to include how to put together and teach mini lessons from the Units of Study for Teaching Writing, how to provide feedback to students by way of individual and small group conferences, how to assess using rubrics and checklists, and how to manage the classroom environment. I can expand on each one of these to provide a more in-depth understanding if necessary.

Throughout the year teachers continued to work together through grade-level meetings where they reviewed and practiced lessons and conferences, we talked about areas of difficulty and refined where necessary, 12 of us attended an October Saturday Reunion day at Teachers College and brought back and presented 10 different literacy-specific professional topics for all elementary teachers, and we continued to talk about and reflect on what was going well and what was tricky. Even though some teachers began to ask questions about what we were planning to do with reading “next year”, we made a commitment that we would remain focused on writing workshop for three years. This meant no new initiatives outside of writing workshop would be considered in order to give teachers plenty of time for professional development and development of grade-level writing curriculum. (As a side note, the history of the professional development approach at Midd-West in previous years was to do something new every year rather than to remain consistent and focused in order to support each initiative.)

The 2010-2011 new curricula, to include the Heinemann Units of Study for Teaching Writing in grades K – 5, was approved by the Board on October 11, 2010.

Additionally, the Board was kept apprised of our work through various professional development schedules and various curriculum and instruction reports throughout the year (See Board Reports for November 8, 2010, January 24, 2011, June 13, 2011)

During the 2011-2012 school year, we continued with writing workshop as planned. In keeping with the implementation timeline, writing workshop moved into the 6th grade classrooms. We sent teachers to summer institutes and brought back knowledge and strategies to our grade-level teams, we supported teachers and administrators as they attended institutes on coaching in order to provide further support to teachers and students in the classroom, we became a Project School and took advantage of professional development days here at Midd-West where

teachers would again be supported directly in the classroom as they worked along-side students. They planned and taught lessons, practiced conferences, and continued to refine their curriculum by aligning their units of study to match other curriculum areas. Professional development became the foundation of our work and it was supported through careful planning and money set aside in the budget to make sure we could provide the kind of support teachers would need. This was also the first year for full-day kindergarten, and kindergarten teachers, seeing the work that was happening in the first and second grade classrooms, made the transition from *Kid Writing* to writing workshop.

Additionally, during the 2011-2012 school year, we were scheduled, per the Pennsylvania Department of Education, to conduct our Academic Standards and Assessment Midpoint Review. It was the Department's process at that time to revisit the District's Strategic Plan mid-way through the cycle. For us, this work began through our curriculum council leadership team in September 2011, year three of the six-year plan. We continued our focus on addressing the original literacy initiatives established in the 2008-2014 Strategic Plan, and we embedded our plans for the implementation of Reader's and Writer's Workshop K-8. This planning allocated \$90,000 for reading and \$90,000 for writing towards "teaching literacy skills through reader's/writer's workshop, which is an instructional method designed to deliver explicit instruction and feedback through well-defined mini lessons & individualized feedback as provided by the teacher." The timeline for implementation of writing workshop provided us with a 8/30/2010 start date, which we followed. The timeline for implementation of reading workshop provided us with a 8/20/2013 start date, which we also followed. (MWSD Academic Standards and Assessment Midpoint Review last updated March 29, 2012, p. 16-19. Board approved April 10, 2012).

During the 2012-2013 school year, we continued with writing workshop as planned. In keeping with the implementation timeline, writing workshop moved into the 7th grade classrooms. Again, we sent teachers to summer institutes to bring back knowledge and strategies to our grade-level teams, we supported teachers and administrators as they attended institutes on coaching in order to provide further support to teachers and students in the classroom, we continued as a Project School where teachers would again be supported as they worked along-side students, planned mini lessons, and wrote curriculum. We also had the support of two literacy coaches during this year who helped and supported teachers in the classroom while they worked with students, but also out of the classroom as they gathered resources and planned professional development (See Board Reports, September 24, 2012 & October 22, 2012).

Our writing scores at that time had grown from 43.1% in 2009 to 77.3% in 2012, a 79.3% increase in three years, and other districts began looking closely at what we were doing. Teachers from Lewisburg visited us to look at our work, we were contacted by Milton inquiring about what we were doing, a Central Columbia principal came to meet with me, and currently we are scheduled for a visitation from BLAST IU #17.

Additionally, during the 2012-2013 school year, we began planning our move into reading (See Board Report, July 30, 2012), as we continued our work with writing workshop. Beverly Abram, our Federal Programs Coordinator, Dane Aucker, elementary principal, and I attended institutes for teaching and coaching reading workshop (See Board Report January 28, 2013), and we began to talk about the transition in our grade-level meetings. Mr. Manotti began utilizing reading

workshop strategies in his classroom. He too had been dissatisfied with the current reading series and felt an immediate change was necessary. He opened his classroom so teachers could visit, and we provided coverage for those who expressed interest. Every elementary teacher knew reading would be the focus during the 2013-2014 school year.

On May 6, 2013, the Board approved sabbaticals for Mrs. Lisa Nesbit and Mrs. Deanna Harvey. The outline of activities they planned was presented in detail in their proposal, which was included in the agenda packets the Board received on May 3, 2013. These activities were fully in support of reader's workshop and included attending trainings, writing a PA Core Standards-aligned curriculum including lessons, assessments, reading skills and strategies, word study, and interactive read-alouds (Board Minutes, May 6, 2013). Additionally, during my report I reminded the Board of our curriculum council work including the timeline for literacy initiatives, the observations of writing workshop, and the plan and discussions moving forward with reading workshop (See Board Report & Minutes, May 6, 2013).

On May 20, 2013, the Board approved the Units of Study for Teaching Reading grades 3 - 5, the Common Core Standards-Aligned Curricular Calendars for Reading, and the Units of Study for Teaching Writing in Opinion, Information, and Narrative, and the Common Core Standards-Aligned Curricular Calendars for Writing.

This brings us to the current 2013-2014 school year. Since my previous presentation outlined the events as they have unfolded this year, I would like to move into your reference to children not learning the basics and my responsibility towards the curriculum.

As stated in my closing paragraph of my recent email to Mr. Abate, pertaining to student achievement, I agree with the Board that student achievement needs to improve. I began telling the Board of this need in August 2009, one month after I began working at Midd-West (Board Report August 3, 2009). I reported on our focus several times before our first year of writing workshop began after that initial report. See Board Minutes for December 21, 2009, February 12, 2010, March 22, 2010, April 12, 2010, May 24, 2010, June 14, 2010, and June 28, 2010, as well as minutes from the literacy team meetings (January, February, March, April & May 2010), and minutes from the 2009-2010 curriculum council meetings (September, October November 2009, March and May 2010).

Student achievement has improved in the areas we have been focusing on such as K-12 writing and high school reading (See charts located in your Board packets October 28, 2013 and February 10, 2014). I will address each area separately and then talk more about how we got to where we are today.

As mentioned before, our elementary writing scores have improved from 43.1% of students who scored proficient on the 5th grade PSSA writing assessment in 2009 to 67.4% of students who scored proficient on the 5th grade PSSA writing assessment in 2013. This is a 56.4% increase in four years. Those are not my numbers, but rather the specific percentages that have been published by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and that can be obtained by accessing the Department's website

Results of the standardized assessment scores in reading over the last five years at the high school have grown from 49.7% of students who scored proficient on the Reading/English

Language Arts assessment in 2009 to 78.3% of students who score proficient in 2013. Again, those are not my numbers, but rather the specific percentages that have been published by the Pennsylvania Department of Education and that can be obtained by accessing the Department's website or the PA School Performance Profile website. This is a 57.5 % increase in scores in four years. The reason for this increase has many components. Primarily, we instituted a new course at the high school called Contemporary Literature. The Board approved this course April 12, 2010. The curriculum for the course was written by teachers and utilizes reading workshop instructional strategies.

It is important to understand, whether discussing the high school reading course, or the elementary structure, that reading workshop is a method that includes several specific components, which I will outline below:

1. A five to ten minute teacher-directed mini lesson. This mini lesson includes one teaching point (objective) for the students to work on, think about, or practice. The mini lesson includes four specific components. First the **Connection**, or the tie-in to what the students learned previously. Second, the **Teach**, or the method or activities the teacher uses to demonstrate how to do the skill they are learning. Third, the **Active Engagement**, or the time the students spend practicing the skill they are learning about in their reading, their writing, or with a partner. Finally, the **Link**, or the quick reminder for students how the skill they learned applies to their work each and every day. The structure of the high school classrooms compared to the elementary school classrooms is different, but the same mini lesson delivery is the same.
2. Time for **independent reading in student self-selected** books. There are two pieces here that are referenced as proven strategies for increasing reading achievement. The first is that there is precious time in the schedule set aside for students to read books that are at their independent reading level. Students who read at their independent reading level will read more because they are reading text they can read and understand. Second, students are self-selecting books. Students who chose the books they want to read based on their interest are more motivated to read because they are reading about things, people, or places that interest them. Again, students will read more if they enjoy what they read. Both pieces referenced here are also modeling what we do in our adult lives when we read, and reading more is paramount to improving reading ability.
3. During the time students are independently reading, the teacher is meeting with small groups of students or individual students. When the teacher meets with a small group it is likely because all students need support in a similar strategy or skill. When the teacher meets with individual students, there is time for one-on-one conferencing and direct and explicit feedback. This method of providing individual students feedback is another proven strategy for improving student's ability to specifically address the skill deficiencies s/he needs.

Reading workshop is not a program, but rather a way of teaching, an instructional strategy, or a methodology. The actual curriculum is what our teachers have been writing utilizing the PA Core Standards and the curricular calendars and units of study materials. The downside to teachers writing curriculum is that it is difficult and time consuming. The upside is that teachers know their Standards better than ever, they know specifically how to teach students to those Standards, and they know what it looks like when a student demonstrates mastery of the Standards. This is one reason why professional development is such a critical part of the work

that we do with teachers, and why we have planned specifically to fund professional development in each of the last four Title II A Federal Program grants and each Board approved Final Budget in 2010 (June 28, 2010) for Funding Year 2011, 2011 (June 27, 2011) for Funding Year 2012, 2012 (June 25, 2012) for Funding Year 2013, and 2013 (June 24, 2013) for Funding Year 2014.

The reading workshop professional development is very different from a program provided by a publisher where the teacher is involved in the delivery of a curriculum largely developed by that publisher. Under our delivery of the workshop model teachers are more intimately involved in the details of the curriculum and gain a better understanding of it and how it needs to be adapted to the needs of our District because they are involved in the actual writing and maintenance of the curriculum. Possibly most important to mention is that this type of professional development is not just about teaching in a reading and/or writing workshop environment, but rather it is about utilizing high-quality teaching strategies that have the biggest impact on student achievement (Engagement, Direct & Explicit Feedback, Independence, Relationships). It is my understanding that you were impressed with this professional development model when you visited on January 8, 2014.

Moving into some of the more direct points from the email, I would like to begin by commenting on the reference to leaving the Board out of things by saying that I am well aware of how the Board feels on this subject. I hope you have gained an appreciation over the last several months that my approach to Board and staff is very different from what may have been followed in the past. I very much believe in a process, which promotes dialogue and respect. I have tried to provide the Board with information about what is happening with respect to the progression of our work in curriculum, instruction, and professional development. I have provided very detailed Board reports, specifically invited the Board to visit the schools during professional development activities or other times of their choosing to observe the work in action, invited the Board to join the Wiki, invited the Board to come in to meet with me to talk in order to provide opportunities for you to ask questions or express concerns, made personal phone calls and sent personal emails asking for time to get together to talk or have lunch. I will continue to demonstrate to the Board that I am open to questions and conversation with the Board of Directors or others who want to discuss these matters.

I noted in your email that you alleged that there has been a misappropriation of funds. I certainly hope that you are not stating in your email that you think anything I have done involves any misappropriation of funds. While I appreciate that you may have had some reservations regarding some of these programs, I am considering your statement an unfortunate misuse of the term or directed at some other situation. The expenditures supporting these programs were all in the budget and all allowable under the Federal guidelines for Title II A expenditures. The Board approved each payment to Heinemann and/or to Teachers College Reading and Writing Project.

As to the comments pertaining to New York City, I really can't express a direct response since I do not know all of the issues they have in implementing their programs. There are, however, a few points I would like to provide for you to consider on this issue.

First, is that we are obviously not New York City even though we do teach to the same Standards as New York. Our issues in the delivery of instruction are in many ways very different and the barriers to implementing a successful program are very different.

Second, is that the execution of a program has probably more to do with its success than any other factor and to that point I hope you appreciate the process that has gone into the implementation of these programs from the planning to the professional development to the consistency of the approach.

Third, is that there is strong support at Midd-West for these programs because many of us believe it is how we can most effectively address the very issues on which we are mutually concerned—improving student achievement. Those who have attempted to make the case that these programs have been banned from New York City schools will need to examine the approved programs listed on the New York City Department of Education’s list of programs (<http://schools.nyc.gov/Offices/District75/Departments/Literacy/Programs/default.htm>).

My advocacy for the reading and writing workshop approach is based on the very elements that were identified at the beginning of this response based on the feedback I received from the Midd-West teachers, the planning that had been done at Midd-West previously, and the direction the Literacy Committee, after careful study has recommended. Specifically, the reading and writing workshop approach addresses:

- The fluency and comprehension challenge
- The need for professional development in differentiated instruction
- The need for positive parent involvement
- The need for professional development to Increase student time on task
- The need to build students’ self-esteem
- The need for professional development to motivate low-motivated students
- The need to improving student achievement with our special education students
- The need to make reading the focus of the whole school so students love of reading intensifies
- The need for training in how to move struggling readers out of the remedial reading track

These are items that were not being addressed in the existing programs currently being taught by Midd-West teachers. The current program has not enabled us to improve scores over the last five years, which is exactly the reason for attempting to transition to a better delivery of reading instruction with better materials more directly aligned to the Standards for which our students will be assessed (See Reading Score Progression Charts).

I hope my actions can be seen as the promotion of a high quality literacy program taught by teachers who have learned about high quality teaching strategies rather than reduced to something as basic as tallying votes to justify my professional judgment on what is considered high quality.

Please do not apologize for sending an abrupt and to the point email. I always appreciate emails or conversations that are to the point as they provide me the opportunity to explain or present information that may be helpful to understanding core issues or concerns. I very much respect others sharing concerns and, in particular, disagreements. It is through this process of dialogue

that we grow and change, validate or invalidate our methods and procedures, and move towards perfection. It is only if we respectfully discuss concerns that we can act as a team in moving forward. Unexpressed concerns tend to fester and create an atmosphere that frustrates all of us and inhibits the kind of success we all want. The key for all of us is to be open and respectful.

I hope this response has removed your concerns regarding unapproved curriculum and training. The Literacy Steering Committee has reached a compromise and a consensus for moving forward, which you can read about in the emails associated with my Board report February 24, 2014. We are moving to get beyond this issue, and we have very important work to get done.

Best regards,
Daphne